

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 were examined in the outstanding office action mailed on 04/19/2007 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). All the claims were rejected.

By virtue of this amendment, claims 1, 5-7, 9-11, 13, 14, 18-20, 22-24, and 26 are sought to be amended and claim 27 is sought to be newly added. The amendments and additions are believed not to introduce new subject matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments and additions are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-27 are thus respectfully presented for further consideration in view of the below remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

In page 2 paragraph 2 of the Outstanding Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, noting that "said second experience profile" in lines 8 and 12 has insufficient antecedent basis. The term "a second experience file" in line 4 of claim 1 is sought to be amended to recite "a second experience profile", thereby providing the required antecedent basis to later terms.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the noting the error, as well as for continuing examination based on the correct interpretation.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0149629 issued to Craycroft *et al* (hereafter "Craycroft") in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101444 issued to Novak *et al* (hereafter "Novak") and US Patent No. 6,469,714 issued to Buxton *et al* (hereafter "Buxton").

Applicants respectfully traverse on several grounds as explained below.

For example, currently amended claim 1 recites, among other features, "... providing said user the ability to specify a first experience profile associated with a first electronic file and a second experience profile file associated with a second electronic file...".

None of the references (relied upon by the Examiner), either individually or in combination, teaches or reasonably suggests, such a feature of specifying corresponding experience profiles associated with respective individual electronic files.

In particular, Craycroft describes an approach to customize a desktop, which is believed to affect the appearance of all windows, including document windows, on the desktop. The basis for such a belief is noted below:

[0006] One type of GUI display is based on a visual metaphor which uses a monitor screen *as a work surface called a "desktop" where documents are presented in relocatable regions termed "windows"*. The user interacts with the computer by, for example, moving objects on the desktop, choosing commands from menus, and manipulating window controls, such as checkboxes and scroll bars. An exemplary desktop screen is reproduced as FIG. 1.

...

[0014] According to exemplary embodiments of the present invention, an improved visual appearance can be provided to GUIs by providing an appearance management layer that gives users (both application developers and end users) *the ability to customize the appearance and behavior of the desktop*. This layer can be provided between all of the clients, e.g., applications, the end user, definition procedures, and the graphic subsystem which actually writes to the display. In this way, a level of abstraction is provided between the client and the system so that customization can be facilitated without requiring the client to have a detailed knowledge of the interface environment, which may be constantly changing.

(Craycroft, *Emphasis Added*)

From the above, it is believed that Craycroft merely provides customization of desktop, which affects the appearance and behavior of various windows, but there is no teaching or suggestion of the claimed ability to associate different experience profiles to different electronic files accessed by the same application.

Novak does not cure this deficiency. In particular, the skins of Novak appear to be associated with the application (and not the claimed electronic files), based on the below disclosure:

[0035] The described embodiments can provide a programming platform to create custom skins. **Skins** can be defined as sets of scripts, art, media, and text files that can be combined to *create a new appearance for whatever software application they are used in conjunction with*. In the description that follows, the inventive skinning techniques and structures are described in the context of their use in conjunction with Microsoft's Windows Media Player software. It is to be appreciated and understood, however, that the inventive techniques and structures can be utilized *in connection with any suitable software application or applications* where it is desirable to provide a user interface in the form of a skin. Specific types of exemplary software applications are simply too numerous to list, but will be appreciated and understood by those of skill in the art.

(Novak, *Emphasis Added*)

Buxton is also believed not to cure the above-noted deficiency based on the below disclosure:

A mechanism for generating *customized graphical user interfaces for applications* in an object-oriented environment is disclosed. Such applications may comprise Java beans, applets or components. The graphic user interface comprises a visual user interface, e.g. an action bar which contain a set of buttons and menus as well as a set of widget and property/command panels, as well as a communication interface through which configuration and user responses are exchanged with the applications. *The relationship between the graphic user interface and an applet is based on the applet communicating selection and user interface information to the graphic user interface, and the graphic user interface handling the user gestures by calling methods on specific interfaces of the applet.* Communications between the graphic user interface and applets occur over an information bus architecture referred to as the InfoBus.

(Abstract of Buxton, *Emphasis Added*)

At least for the reasons noted above, it is asserted that currently amended claim 1 is allowable over the art of record.

Claims 2-13 and 27 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to currently amended claim 1.

Currently amended claim 5 is allowable independently in reciting that. "... storing an association information indicating that said first experience profile is associated with said first electronic file and said second experience profile is associated with said second electronic file; ... examining said association information ... in response to said receiving; ...".

At least for reasons noted above with respect to currently amended independent claim 1, it is believed that none of the references, individually or in combination, teaches such a feature.

Currently amended claim 7 is independently allowable in reciting that, "... playing music represented by said music file using another application while enabling editing of said document using said application."

Currently amended claim 9 is independently allowable in reciting that, "... displaying on a display unit a plurality of experience profiles available for association with electronic files, ... receiving a selection ... indicates that said first experience profile is to be associated with said first electronic file."

Currently amended independent claim 10 is also allowable over the art of record at least in reciting, "... enabling said user to specify an experience attribute associated with said first application ..., wherein said experience attribute is provided by a second application; and causing said second application to control said experience attribute ... while said user accesses said first electronic file using said first application".

The Outstanding Office Action makes no reference to the claimed second application and thus does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Irrespective, it is asserted that the references relied upon by the Examiner do not teach or reasonably suggest the above recited feature of claim 10. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 with respect to currently amended claim 10 is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-13 depend from claim 10 and are allowable over the art of record at least for the reasons noted above with respect to currently amended claim 10.

Currently amended claim 11 is independently allowable at least in reciting that, "... said second application plays said song while said user edits said editable file using said first application".

Currently amended independent claim 14 is also allowable at least for some of the reasons given above with respect to claim 1 in reciting, among other features, "... providing said user the ability to specify a first experience profile associated with a first electronic file and a second experience profile file associated with a second electronic file...".

Claims 15-22 depend from claim 14 and are also allowable at least for some of the reasons noted above.

Currently amended independent claim 23 is also allowable at least for some of the reasons given above with respect to claim 10 in reciting, "... enabling said user to specify an experience attribute associated with said first application ..., wherein said experience attribute is provided by a second application; and causing said second application to control said experience attribute ... while said user accesses said first electronic file using said first application".

Claims 24-26 depend from claim 23 and are allowable over the art of record at least for some of the reasons noted above.

New claim 27 is also allowable at least for some of the reasons noted above with respect to claim 5 in reciting, "...wherein said storing stores said association information in a non-volatile memory".

Conclusion

Accordingly all the rejections of record are believed to be overcome, and applicants respectfully request their withdrawal. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta

Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number: 41,416

Date: July 17, 2007